1 2 3 4 5	JOHN A. RUSSO, City Attorney, SBN-129729 RANDOLPH W. HALL, Asst. City Atty., SBN-08014 JAMES F. HODGKINS, Sup. Trial Atty., SBN-1425 CHARLES E. VOSE, Senior Deputy City Atty., SB ONE FRANK H. OGAWA PLAZA 6th Floor OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, 94612 TELEPHONE (510) 238-2961 Fax: (510) 238-650 cevose@oaklandcityattorney.org 25581/444147	661 N-139700
6	ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANTS CITY OF OAKLAND, OAKLAND POLICE DEPARTMENT, CHIEF WAYNE TUCKER and SGT. BERNARD ORTIZ	
7 8 9 10	JOHN J. VERBER, ESQ., SBN-139917 JAMES Y. HIGA, ESQ., SBN-225683 BURNHAM BROWN 1901 HARRISON STREET, 11 TH Floor OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, 94612 TELEPHONE (510) 444-6800 Fax: (510) 835-666 jverber@burnhambrown.com jhiga@burnhambrown.com	66
12	ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT OFFICER RAMON ALCANTAR STEVEN R. JACOBSEN, BAR NO. 95246 EMAIL; SRJ@THEACCIDENTALLAWYER.COM CATHERINE R. DOUAT, BAR NO. 129134 EMAIL: CAT@THEACCIDENTALLAWYER.COM LAW OFFICES OF STEVEN R. JACOBSEN 901 CLAY STREET OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA 94607 TELEPHONE (510) 465-1500; FAX (510) 465-1501	
14 15 16		
18 19	ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFFS MIGUEL & BENJAMIN ORTEGA	
20	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
21	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
22		
23	MIGUEL ORTEGA, BENJAMIN ORTEGA, A Minor, By And Through His) Case No.:C-07-02659 JCS
24	Guardian Ad Litem, ANA ROSA ORTEGA,	UPDATED JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE
25	Plaintiffs,	STATEMENT
26	VS.)) DATE: April 4 2008
27 28	CITY OF OAKLAND, OAKLAND POLICE DEPARTMENT, CHIEF WAYNE TUCKER, In His Capacity As The Police) DATE: April 4, 2008) TIME: 10:30 a.m.) COURTROOM: A, 15 th Floor)

Chief Of The City Of Oakland, RAMON J. ALCANTAR, Individually And In His Capacity As A Police Officer For The City Of Oakland, BERNARD ORTIZ, Individually And In His Capacity As A Police Officer For The City Of Oakland, and Does 1 through 200,

The Honorable Magistrate Judge JOSEPH C. SPERO

Defendants.

The parties to the above-entitled action jointly submit this Updated Joint Case Management Statement and Proposed Order and request the Court adopt it as its Case Management Order in this case.

F. The parties which have not been served and the reason:

All parties have been served with the summons and complaint. Plaintiffs filed a Second Amended Complaint which added a new cause of action in violation of FRCP section 15(a) as leave of the court had not been given, there was no stipulation by the parties to add a new cause of action, and the answers to the First Amended Complaint had already been filed. Plaintiffs' counsel agreed to file a third amended complaint to correct the problem and agreed that the parties would not have to answer the Second Amended Complaint. However the Third Amended Complaint has yet to be filed. Plaintiffs have served the amended complaint and will file the amended complaint with the court's permission on April 7, 2008.

III. DISCOVERY

Plaintiffs: The defendants have named a number of police officers as witnesses in this matter. Defendants provided a CD Rom with the interviews of those officers as well as the Internal Affairs Investigation file, which contained a number of interviews with the officers, named in the defendants' initial FRCP Rule 26 Disclosure. Plaintiff intends to depose several of the officers who had knowledge of the facts in this case and their observations concerning the allegations of plaintiffs' false arrest and personal injuries. Plaintiffs intend to notice the depositions of these officers within the next thirty days.

///

Plaintiffs' counsel has provided narratives of the proposed testimony of all witnesses disclosed in the plaintiffs' supplemental FRCP Rule 26 Disclosure. For those witnesses that the plaintiffs have identified but have been unable to interview, the plaintiffs have provided telephone numbers to allow the defendants' counsel to contact the witnesses directly.

Plaintiff Benjamin Ortega treated at Kaiser Hospital Oakland concerning physiological injuries. Master Ortega does not recall the name of the counselor with whom he treated. Plaintiffs have provided the defendants' counsel with authorizations for the release of medical records, including treatment by psychologists.

Plaintiffs' counsel was contacted on April 1, 2008, by defendants' counsel with the request that plaintiffs produce Genesis Preciado and Eduardo Ortega for deposition pursuant to a notice of deposition in lieu of serving these witnesses with subpoenas. Defendants' counsel required an answer by April 2, 2008. Plaintiffs' counsel has only been able to contact Genesis Preciado, in this short period of time. Mr. Preciado is a part-time student and holds a job on a part-time basis. Mr. Preciado has agreed to be deposed so long as the deposition is set for 5:00 p.m. or later so that he not miss school or work. Plaintiffs' counsel will continue to attempt to contact Eduardo Ortega.

Defendants: Plaintiffs have provided a Supplemental Rule 26 Disclosure listing nine additional witnesses, including addresses for five of the nine additional witnesses. Plaintiffs have provided telephone numbers for the remaining four witnesses. The narratives (as to the witness' proposed testimony) lack detail for six of the nine additional witnesses so it is difficult to determine what those six witnesses will testify to. Therefore, at this time, it is difficult to determine whether we will require the depositions of any or all of those six additional witnesses. However, we anticipate receiving supplemental information from Plaintiffs' counsel as it becomes available to them to assist in our evaluation. However, Plaintiffs have produced the signed declarations of Eduardo Ortega and Genesis Preciado (two of the nine additional witnesses). Defendants intend to notice the depositions of these two witnesses for April 21, 2008.

Plaintiffs also produced some medical records for Benjamin Ortega and also 1 2 produced a signed release from Benjamin Ortega for his Kaiser medical records. Defendants will therefore subpoena plaintiff Benjamin Ortega's medical records. 3 Plaintiffs' counsel has failed to provide the name(s) of any psychiatric treatment 4 providers. 5 V. **DISPOSITIVE MOTIONS** 6 7 Defendants may file a motion for summary judgment for qualified immunity for Defendant police officers and a motion for summary judgment for Defendants City of 8 Oakland and Chief Wayne Tucker. There are no motions currently pending. 9 10 DATED: APRIL 2, 2008 11 12 JOHN A. RUSSO, City Attorney RANDOLPH W. HALL, Assistant City Attorney 13 JAMES F. HODGKINS, Supervising Trial Attorney CHARLES E. VOSE, Senior Deputy City Attorney 14 By: 15 Attorneys for Defendants CITY OF OAKLAND, OAKLAND POLICE DEPARTMENT, 16 CHIEF WAYNE TUCKER, SGT. BERNARD ORTIZ 17 DATED: APRIL 2, 2008 18 JOHN VERBER, ESQ. JAMES Y. HIGA, ESQ. 19 **BURNHAM BROWN** 20 By: /s/ Attorneys for Defendant 21 OFFICÉR RAMON ALCANTAR 22 DATED: APRIL 2, 2008 23 LAW OFFICES OF STEVEN R. JACOBSEN 24 By: CATHERINE R. DOUAT 25 Attorney for Plaintiffs BENJAMIN ORTEGA AND MIGUEL ORTEGA 26 27 28